Application No. 10/642,382   Atty. Docket No. 042390.P17497
Response to Office Action of December 15, 2006   TC/A.U. 2815

Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent

application as amended herein. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 5-25 have been

withdrawn. No claims have been added or cancelled. Thus, claims 1-4 remain pending

in the application.

Claim Rejections § 112

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which the applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to

more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. The Applicant respectfully requests that

the rejection of claims 1-4 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections § 102

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 6,037,792 issued to McClure (*McClure*). The Applicant respectfully submits

that claims 1-4 are not anticipated by *McClure* for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP"), in § 2131, states:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the
> claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art
> reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2
> USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in

-7-

as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 869 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Thus, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated *only if* each and every element of the claim is found in the cited reference and the cited reference must show the invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim.

Amended claim 1 recites:

> A semiconductor device comprising:
> core logic;
> clock generation circuitry coupled with the core logic, the clock generation circuitry including a multiplexer to select one of a plurality of clock signals to clock the core logic, wherein the selected clock signal is provided to the core logic and the core logic generates heat for **self-heating burn-in** responsive, at least in part, to the selected clock signal; and
> a thermal sensing circuitry to monitor an internal temperature of the semiconductor device, wherein the internal temperature is based, at least in part, on the heat generated by the core logic responsive to the selected clock signal.

The Office action draws the Applicant's attention to *McClure* which is directed to an "integrated circuit ... [that] provides a burn-in stress test mode that facilitates stress testing of an integrated circuit device **in a burn-in oven**" (emphases added). Thus, *McClure* discloses that a burn-in oven is used to burn-in the integrated circuit.

In contrast to *McClure*, claim 1 is directed to a semiconductor device that is capable of a **self-heating** burn-in. Claim 1 includes limitations that enable this self-heating burn-in feature. For example, claim 1 recites, "clock generation circuitry ... to select one of a plurality of clock signals ... wherein the selected clock signal is provided to the core logic and the core logic generates heat for **self-heating burn-in** responsive, at least in part, to the selected clock signal" (emphasis added). The Applicant respectfully submits that *McClure* does not disclose "clock generation circuitry ... to select one of a plurality of clock signals ... wherein the selected clock signal is provided to the core

-8-

Application No. 10/642,382   Atty. Docket No. 042390.P17497
Response to Office Action of December 15, 2006   TC/A.U. 2815

logic and the core logic generates heat for self-heating burn-in responsive, at least in part,

to the selected clock signal," as recited in claim 1. For at least the reason that *McClure*

does not disclose the above-cited limitations, *McClure* cannot anticipate claim 1. Thus,

the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. For at least the reason that dependent claims

include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully

submits that claims 2-4 are not anticipated by *McClure*.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if

such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 16, 2007   /Philip A. Pedigo/
                                              Philip A. Pedigo
                                              Reg. No. 52,107
                                              Attorney for Intel Corporation

Intel Corporation
Patents and Licensing
Mailstop – JF3-147
2111 NE 25th Avenue
Hillsboro, Oregon 97124
Tele – (503) 712-5560
Fax – (503) 264-1729

-9-